

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	· FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,830	12/13/2001	Ryoji Hagiwara	S004-4504	7493	
7	590 05/01/2003				
ADAMS & WILKS			EXAMINER		
31st Floor 50 Broadway			YOUNG, CHRISTOPHER G		
New York, NY	10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1756		
			DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003	DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ربر

		4 "4/->
	Application No. 10/016,830	Applicant(s) HAGIWARA efal.
Office Action Summary	i =	0
_	Examiner	ng 1756
-The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet L	7
Peri d for Reply		•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ET TO EXPIREO	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by de Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by 	, a reply within the statutory mininfault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro	num of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication .
Status	1 1	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	12/13/01	
☐ This action is FINAL.	•	
 Since this application is in condition for allowance ex- accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 		
Disp sition of Claims		
✓ Claim(s)	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.	
/_/	are subject to restriction or election	
Claim(s)		requirement.
•		
Application Papers		
•	wing Review, PTO-948.	☐ disapproved.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's P	twing Review, PTO-948. is □ approved	☐ disapproved.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	twing Review, PTO-948. is □ approved	□ disapproved.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved bjected to by the Examiner.	□ disapproved.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved bjected to by the Examiner.	□ disapproved.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	twing Review, PTO-948. is approved bjected to by the Examiner. er. ty under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)	-(d).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	twing Review, PTO-948. is approved bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a) s of the priority documents humber)	-(d). ave been
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drain The proposed drawing correction, filed on	twing Review, PTO-948. is approved bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a) s of the priority documents had a more a surface of the priority documents had a linternational Bureau (PCT)	-(d). nave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drain The proposed drawing correction, filed on	twing Review, PTO-948. is approved bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a) s of the priority documents had a more a surface of the priority documents had a linternational Bureau (PCT)	-(d). nave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drain The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are of the drawing(s) filed on is/are of the specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority and all Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number of the Certified copies not received:	awing Review, PTO-948 is	-(d). nave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drain The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are of the drawing(s) filed on is/are of the specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority and in the complete of the CERTIFIED copies of the certified copies in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Attachm nt(s)	awing Review, PTO-948 is approved bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a) s of the priority documents hamber) International Bureau (PCT) er No(s)	-(d). nave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Application/Control Number: 10/016,830 Page 2

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a method, classified in class 430, subclass 296.
 - II. Claims 5 and 6, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 250, subclass 492.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions of Group I and of Group II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method could be performed using any well known particle beam apparatus and close inspection by a technician to assure equal dose amounts per region.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. A telephone call was made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 10/016,830

Art Unit: 1756

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Young whose telephone number is (703) 308-2984.

CHRISTOPHER G. YOUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 3

cgy

April 28, 2003